



OFFICE OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

PO BOX 202501
HELENA MT 59620-2501
www.opi.mt.gov
(406) 444-3095
(888) 231-9393
(406) 444-0169 (TTY)

Linda McCulloch
Superintendent

***Small Schools Accountability Process (SSAP)
School Year 2005-2006***

Guide to the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report

The Small Schools Accountability Process (SSAP) is based on several significant factors. These factors include the Criterion-Referenced Test scores (CRT), the Norm-Referenced Test scores (NRT), the Effectiveness Report of the Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan, CRT improvement, NRT improvement, and attendance or graduation rate. The CRT data, NRT data, graduation rate, and attendance are quantitative and consist of multiple data sets. The total possible points for every school and district will vary according to the number of data sets available. The Effectiveness Report is a qualitative evaluation of goals, action plans, professional development, and curriculum development. Together, the quantitative and qualitative factors generate a comprehensive overview of a school's or district's progress in the continuous school improvement process. The various components of the SSAP are weighted on a scale from one to ten based on their relative importance.

Phase I

Part I Data compilation

Phase II

Part 1 CRT Achievement-Three Years of Data

- 1 point possible per year in reading for making the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) – 55 percent of students proficient in the first two years, 74 percent of students proficient in the third year
- 1 point possible per year in math for making the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO)- 40 percent of students proficient in the first two years, 51 percent of students proficient in the third year
- 1 point possible per year for each subgroup for making the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) in each subject
 - If there are ten or more students in the subgroup

The actual points are weighted by 10.

In the example below, the district had no students tested in one of the three years. So there are only 2 possible points instead of 3.

<u>Small Schools Accountability Process Score Summary – School Year (SY) 05-06</u>						
County:		Legal Entity:		School Code:		
DISTRICT		<i>Total Points: (Weighted)</i>		376 of 459 (81.9%)		
Phase II		<i>Points (unweighted) for Phase II: 54 of 65</i>				
<u>Part 1</u>	<u>CRT Achievement</u>		<u>Weight Factor:</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>Actual Points</u>	<u>Possible Points</u>
	Subject	Subgroup				
	Reading	All Students			2	2
	Reading	White			2	2
	Reading	Economically Disadvantaged			2	2
	Reading	Students with disabilities			0	2
	Math	All Students			2	2
	Math	White			2	2
	Math	Economically Disadvantaged			2	2
	Math	Students with Disabilities			0	2

Subgroup did not meet AMO

Part 1 CRT Participation Rate

- 1 point possible for achieving a rate of 95 percent
 - Based on the best of these:
 - Current year,
 - Current year averaged with previous year, or
 - Current year averaged with previous two years.

The actual point is weighted by 2.

For example, a school whose participation rate dropped to 94 percent for the current year, if in the previous two years, the rates were 95 percent and 96 percent then the state may average these three years to meet the 95 percent participation rate requirement.

Part 2 NRT Achievement-Five Years of Data

- 1 point possible per year in reading for having 50 percent or more of all students proficient (45 NCE or higher)
- 1 point possible per year in math for having 50 percent or more of all students proficient (45 NCE or higher)
- 1 point possible per year for each other subgroup for having 50 percent or more students proficient in each subject (45 NCE or higher)
 - If there are ten or more students in the subgroups

The actual points are weighted by 4.

Part 3 Attendance Rate or Graduation Rate Indicator

- Grades K-8
 - 1 point for meeting the 80 percent threshold or showed improvement toward meeting that threshold from the previous year
- Grades 9-12
 - 1 point for meeting the 80 percent threshold or showed improvement toward meeting that threshold from the previous year

The actual point is weighted by 2.

Phase III

Part 1 Effectiveness Report

- See enclosed sample scoring rubric.
- 12 items for AYP (items 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 17)
 1. 2 on the scoring guide equals 1 point
 2. 1 on the scoring guide equals .5 point
 3. 0 on the scoring guide equals 0
 4. For yes/no questions:
 1. Yes = 1
 2. No = 0
- 9 items for feedback report only (items 3, 10, 11, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, plus overall comments)

The actual points are weighted by 5.

Part 2 CRT Improvement- SY 03-04 to SY 04-05 and SY 04-05 to SY 05-06 (two intervals)

- 1 point possible for all students showing improvement in reading from each previous year.
- 1 point possible for all students showing improvement in math from each previous year.
- 1 point possible per other subgroup showing improvement in each subject from the previous year
 - If there are ten or more students in the subgroup

The actual point is weighted by 3.

Part 2 NRT Improvement and Maintaining Proficiency SY 01-02 to SY 02-03, SY 02-03 to SY 03 -04, SY 03-04 to SY 04-05, and SY 04-05 to SY 05-06 (four intervals)

- 1 point possible per interval for all students showing improvement or maintaining 50 percent of all students proficient in reading
- 1 point possible per interval for all students showing improvement or maintaining 50 percent of all students proficient in math
- 1 point possible per interval for each other subgroup for showing improvement or maintaining 50 percent of students proficient in each subject
 - If there are ten or more students in the subgroup

The actual points are weighted by 4.